



PRESS AND LIBRARY COLLABORATION SURVEY

SURVEY CONDUCTED: 2012
FINAL REPORT: 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Acknowledgments	2
Executive Summary	3
Survey Summary Data	3
Survey Participation	3
Organizational Information	4
Financial Information	5
Publishing Programs	9
Publishing Partnerships	13
Perspectives	17
Follow-up Interviews	21
Appendix A	34

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this survey of university press-library relationships in North America, originally conducted in May 2012, was to map similarities and differences in operational and financial structures as well as practical differences. The goal of the survey was to generate information that would help AAUP press directors and staff, and ARL library directors or directors of scholarly communication, to better understand the variety of relationships that exist.

The survey was administered via SurveyMonkey, with the target audience consisting of library directors, deans, and university librarians; and university press directors. Responses were received from leaders of 42 libraries and 41 university presses. The responding institutions are listed in Appendix A. The questions posed could be answered by either audience.

In May 2013, after initial analysis of the survey results, members of the AAUP Library Relations Committee conducted follow-up interviews via telephone with 18 (21.7%) of the respondents. The interview questions focused on the “why” of library publishing services, with some additional detail requested on certain aspects of library-press relationships. Those interviews appear at the end of this report.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The members of the AAUP Library Relations Committee of 2011-2012 created and administered the survey in collaboration with the AAUP Central Office.

Patrick Alexander, Penn State University Press (chair)
Julia Gammon, University of Akron Press
Jenny Gavacs, University of Chicago Press
Peter Mickulas, Rutgers University Press
Lisa Quinn, Wilfrid Laurier University Press
Leila Salisbury, University Press of Mississippi
Lynda Schuh, University of Illinois Press
J. Alex Schwartz, Northern Illinois University Press
Charles Watkinson, Purdue University Press

The members of the AAUP Library Relations Committee of 2012-2013 compiled, analyzed, and summarized the results, and created and conducted the follow-up interviews.

Jane Bunker, Northwestern University Press (chair)
Donna Dixon, SUNY Press
Julia Gammon, University of Akron Press
Jenny Gavacs, University of Chicago Press
Suzanne Guidod, Syracuse University Press
Alex Holzman, Temple University Press
Peter Mickulas, Rutgers University Press
Peter Potter, Cornell University Press
Lisa Quinn, Wilfrid Laurier University Press
Leila Salisbury, University Press of Mississippi
Lynda Schuh, University of Illinois Press
Charles Watkinson, Purdue University Press

Special thanks to Julia Blixrud, Assistant Executive Director, Scholarly Communication, of the Association of Research Libraries, for her support and assistance with this project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The quantitative and objective results of the survey follow. The AAUP Library Relations Committee distilled the following five broad conclusions from these results.

1. Library publishing services are on the rise. 65% of respondents say library-publishing programs are an increasingly important service. 62% of all respondents (77% of library respondents and 34% of press respondents) to this question agree that publishing should be part of the library's mission. Presses must imagine a way of engaging with these and other emerging publishers on campus.

2. Collaboration rather than duplication is recommended. 69% of respondents believe that library-publishing initiatives should complement press publishing programs, rather than reinventing (or duplicating) a service for formal peer-reviewed literature.

3. Recognize and discuss mission overlap. 95% of respondents see the need for presses and libraries to engage with each other about issues facing scholarly publishing beyond the usual topics of open access, fair use, and copyright. Common interests—such as how to best serve scholars—rather than areas of divergence, would be fruitful topics of discussion.

4. Understand the scope of publishing activity on your campus. Respondents indicated some knowledge of many on-campus publishing operations, but a large percentage of respondents had no sense of number or scale. Recognize where these operations present opportunities for your press.

5. Look beyond the financial figures. Many libraries provide support to presses, but it is usually in-kind rather than money. While in only 11% of cases did the library provide cash support to a press, more than 53% of libraries provide other kinds of service ranging from digitization, metadata, and preservation services to office support and rent-free space.

SURVEY SUMMARY DATA

SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

Questions 1-5

Respondents were asked to provide their name, title, institution, and email address, and to indicate whether they were a representative of a press or a library.

Of 83 total respondents, 50% were from university presses, 50% from libraries. Libraries and presses participating in the survey are listed in [Appendix A](#).

ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION

6. How many full-time employees does your [library or press] have?

# OF EMPLOYEES	% OF RESPONDENTS
10 or fewer	13.8%
11 – 20	13.8%
21 – 50	20.0%
51 – 100*	5.0%
101 – 200**	20.0%
201 - 300	12.5%
301 - 400	10.0%
More than 400	5.0%

* 51-100: One press; the remainder libraries

** 101-200: Two presses; the remainder libraries

Otherwise, all responses for 50 or fewer employees were reported by presses, and all responses for 51 or more employees were reported by libraries.

7. To whom does the press at your institution report?

POSITION	% OF RESPONDENTS
Provost or equivalent	37.5%
Various other deans, vice-provosts, etc.	27.6%
Library Dean or Director	17.5%
Vice President for Research or equivalent	11.3%
Independent board	6.3%

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 6)

8. What is the board structure of the press at your institution? Check all that apply.

BOARD STRUCTURE	% OF RESPONDENTS
Editorial Board	77.6%
Management Advisory Board	22.4%
Mgmt. Executive Board/Board of Trustees	19.7%

9. Does the library have a formal representative on the press board(s)?

Y/N	% OF RESPONDENTS
Yes	58.4%
No	41.6%

10. How often do representatives of the press and the library meet?

<u>FREQUENCY</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Once a week or more often	6.6% (5)
Once a month or more often	23.7% (18)
Once a quarter or more often	35.5% (27)
Once a year or more often	23.7% (18)
Every few years	5.3% (4)
Never	5.3% (4)

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 1)

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

11. Does the library provide direct financial support to the press? If so, how much?

<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
No support	88.3%
Yes: \$1 - \$10,000	2.6% (2)
Yes: \$10,001 - \$25,000	1.3% (1)
Yes: \$25,001 - \$50,000	1.3% (1)
Yes: \$50,001 - \$100,000	1.3% (1)
Yes: more than \$100,000	5.2% (4)

12. What other resources does the library provide to the press? Check all that apply.

<u>RESOURCES</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Library provides no other resources	47.3%
Preservation services	18.9% (14)
Digitization services for free	18.9% (14)
IT support services for free	17.6% (13)
Metadata services	10.8% (8)
Rent-free space	10.8% (8)
Business office services	10.8% (8)
Digitization services for a fee	9.5% (7)
Legal services for free	8.1% (6)
Free utilities (e.g., phone, electricity, internet)	4.1% (3)
Subsidized utilities	4.1% (3)
Mailing services	4.1% (3)
Space at full cost-recovery	1.4% (1)

Subsidized IT support services	1.4% (1)
Cost-recovery IT support services	1.4% (1)
Legal services for a fee	1.4% (1)

Other (please specify)—additional responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- Human resources services; some financial services
- Rights clearance support; human resources support
- We have provided funding to subvent or support specific publications.
- The library has provided financial assistance in the past for publication and continues to host a number of electronic publications on library servers.
- Service on several advisory boards

Press Respondents:

- Archiving of press files
- We reimburse the Library for basic IT support but we also receive technology support that we do not pay for—some hardware and a portion of FTE for an IT project manager who assists with major technology implementations, of which we have several.
- Consultation
- Use of Digital Commons (journals) for free
- Soon to host open access textbooks
- We provide the library with gratis copies of all books we publish; they give us nothing.
- Archiving of press records and books
- Digital storage and delivery of authors' extra materials, e.g., an online poetry anthology

13. What are the financial expectations of the *press* at your institution? Can you define “acceptable loss” or “reasonable profit”?

<u>EXPECTATION</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Recovering costs of publishing program, including staff and overhead costs	40.5% (30)
Making an “acceptable loss” (please elaborate below)	25.7% (19)
Don’t Know	16.2% (12)
Recovering costs of publishing program, NOT including staff and overhead costs	13.5% (10)
Making a “reasonable profit” (please elaborate below)	4.1% (3)

Answers to “please elaborate”—responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- Press is held to a subsidy of ca. \$325,000/year.
- The Press gets a budget from the University that covers its expenses to the degree that sales/revenues don't (i.e., a subsidy).
- Press is subsidized by half a million dollars from the Institution (not the library).
- They have a subvention from Arts & Sciences.
- Reasonable profit is to have any profit over the costs of the publishing program including staff and the operations, but not including space.
- Wish there was “other.” All costs except \$750,000 subsidy
- Receives a small subsidy
- Losing no more than a specified subsidy
- Press also operates campus bookstores which provide sufficient margin to subsidize publishing activities

Press Respondents:

- We are not-for-profit and the overall goal is to bring in some profit that can be reinvested into the press and staff. Many business units beyond publishing contribute to this (e.g. distribution center, retail).
- Making ends meet with a subvention of about \$350,000
- Breakeven after endowment spending and university support
- We are in the process of buying out our dependence
- Loss no larger than the budgeted operating subsidy
- Meeting our budget that includes university support
- Annual allocation covers about 30% of total costs.
- We are expected to be breakeven with an 11-12% of budget institutional allocation. We regularly exceed that and that fact makes the board and the university presidents happy.
- Within range of budgeted operating subsidy
- We are highly subsidized, for us it is about getting research we fund out to a wide audience.
- We do receive a modest subvention, below AAUP average subvention.
- Covering variable costs and some labor
- Our university provides about \$320,000 toward staff costs and covers a portion of rent. Our dean also is currently allotting up to \$100,000 more for the Press, as needed (and typically, it's all needed).
- We recover a large percentage of staff costs; subsidy covers part.
- We have a very small subsidy but must break even using it.
- The university covers three salaries, but also charges an “administrative overhead fee” of 7.6% of the Press's budget. The net result is a relatively small subvention in comparison to our peers.

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 4)

14. What are the financial expectations for *library* publishing programs and services at your institution? Can you define “acceptable loss” or “reasonable profit”?

<u>EXPECTATION</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Don't Know	35.2% (25)
The library does not undertake publishing activities	31.0% (22)
Making an “acceptable loss” (please elaborate below)	22.5% (16)
Recovering costs of publishing program, including staff and overhead costs	8.5% (6)
Recovering costs of publishing program, NOT including staff and overhead costs	2.8% (2)
Making a “reasonable profit” (please elaborate below)	0.0% (0)

Answers to “please elaborate”—responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- We provide publishing consulting and support services to faculty as part of our normal operations, e.g., OJS software.
- Thus far we have provided services that support dissemination based on partnership agreements or grants.
- Not in dollar figures. The issue is how to maximize the service we can provide to faculty/students, within limits of staffing.
- The library publishes newsletters and occasional other projects (print and electronic) from within its regular budget and does not price these items separately.
- We provide services including subscriptions for journals at this point.
- We are focused on open access publications and do not charge fees inside the university.
- The library publishes open access journals and absorbs costs from its own budget.
- The library funds the publishing program from its budget.
- The library makes use of the director’s unrestricted gift funds to publish a variety (poetry, chapbooks, scholarly publications) of material with a goal of open access. The publishing is intended to support alternative forms of publication.
- This is seen as a service like most others.
- The library in partnership with the press publishes 30 journals and maintains open access repositories in several disciplines, and mounts press titles online, etc., under our DScibe Digital Publishing Program. For the most part, this is considered library service and no charges are made.
- Usually the library doesn’t charge
- Staying within a specified subsidy
- We consider our small but growing publishing program to be an investment in university partnerships so we have mostly worked it into the operating budget.
- Publishing, including OA journals, funded from library operating budget and some grants.
- Publishing program is open access and library subsidized

Press Respondents:

- Very substantial expenditures by the library on an open access site, no perceivable quality control, no revenues
- No record-keeping by libraries that I am aware of; press loses in these joint endeavors
- Not formalized as a “loss”—it is more that library publishing services are entirely subsidized by the library’s operations budget
- They consider providing publishing services that are just that, a service, and there is no consideration of any cost recovery.
- Our libraries undertake some publishing activities, but I don’t know any details about their finances.

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 8)

PUBLISHING PROGRAMS

15. Does your [press or library] publish electronic materials?

<u>Y/N</u>	<u>% OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Yes	90.8%
No	7.9%
Don’t know	1.3%

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 5)

16. Has your institution identified other publishing programs on campus or throughout the system (beyond press or library publishing activity)?

<u>Y/N</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Yes, there’s a list available	19.7% (15)
No, but formal campus sources give this information	5.3% (4)
No, but good information is available through informal sources	44.7% (34)
No, this information isn’t available	30.3% (23)

17. If there are other publishing programs on campus, with which units are they associated? Check all that apply.

UNITS	% (#) OF RESPONDENTS
Academic departments or research centers	89.2% (58)
Museum or gallery	56.9% (37)
Marketing and media department	47.7% (31)
Extension service	27.7% (18)
IT department or equivalent	7.7% (5)

Other (please specify)—additional responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- Partnership between academic units and library
- Technology Review

Press Respondents:

- Law Review published by Law School
- Individual faculty publishing programs; e.g., poetry publisher
- The IT department offers design and printing

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 2)

18. What types of publishing programs or services does your library undertake? Check all that apply.

TYPES	% (#) OF RESPONDENTS
Institutional Repository	80.5% (62)
Electronic Theses and Dissertations	62.3% (48)
Archives & Special Colls. Reprints/Facsimiles	48.1% (37)
Data Curation	44.2% (34)
Other Non-peer reviewed materials	37.7% (29)
Peer-reviewed journals independently	
or with other departments	32.5% (25)
Co-publications with press	24.7% (19)
Student Journals	22.1% (17)
Conference Proceedings	20.8% (16)
Peer-reviewed books independently	
or with other departments	3.9% (3)
None	3.9% (3)
Don't Know	2.6% (2)

Other (please specify)—additional responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- Oral Histories, digital, and print on demand
- As noted above, we provide a variety of support services, but not responsibility for editorial content.
- Hosting journals using PKP Open Journal System (OJS)
- University history, publications of University Archives alone or in collaboration with Arts & Sciences
- Partnerships between others and library

Press Respondents:

- We anticipate a joint digital imprint between the Press and the Library in the future.
- Oral history short-run handbooks and accompanying website
- POD from online collections of non-copyrighted materials
- Main library has just purchased an Espresso Book Machine for use by faculty/students/patrons
- We have a book series with our Special Collections department, based on their materials.
- Supports publication of Technical Reports
- Poetry chapbooks, probably other stuff I don't know of. I think there is one peer-reviewed journal.
- There is a fledgling effort to support journals through OJS; I am treating that below as not providing these services.

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 10 and 11)

19. How do these library publication programs serve scholars? Check all that apply.

SERVICE	% (#) OF RESPONDENTS
For preservation	65.3% (49)
For outreach/service	62.7% (47)
For promotion and tenure	22.7% (17)
Unsure	13.3% (10)
The library does not provide these services	10.7% (8)

Other (please specify) — additional responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- “Publication programs” does not match our approach, e.g., sMediaCommons
- For access to research sources
- Ease of dissemination, open access
- For visibility
- Metadata services

Press Respondents:

- Discoverability
- For archiving and making accessible their scholarship/research

20. Are these increasingly important services for your library?

Y/N	% OF RESPONDENTS
Yes, increasingly important	64.6%
Level of importance is steady	15.4%
No, other priorities are becoming more important	10.8%
The library does not provide these services	9.2%

Additional comments here included:

Library Respondents:

- Budget constraints require a tighter focus on publishing.

Press Respondents:

- Move to digital humanities is happening outside of library
- The library is committed to a library-publishing program of some sort. How it evolves remains to be seen.
- I haven’t noted an expansion beyond what seems to be mostly experimentation.
- Or at least increasingly discussed
- The library seems to think that they are.
- Library leadership is currently changing, so I don’t know.

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 9)

21. Do the press and library at your institution collaborate on publishing programs?

<u>Y/N</u>	<u>% OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Yes	48.7%
No	51.3%

PUBLISHING PARTNERSHIPS

22. Is your institution interested in pursuing a partnership between the press and the library? If your institution is interested in pursuing a press/library partnership, do you have formal plans to do so? *(Note: 46 respondents skipped this question; 37 responded.)*

<u>Y/N</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Yes, if we can create balanced/working partnership	70.3% (26)
No, circumstances preclude such collaboration	29.7% (11)

23. If your institution is not interested in a press/library partnership, what are the reasons? Check all that apply. *(Note: 69 respondents skipped this question; 14 responded.)*

<u>REASONS</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Financial concerns	28.6% (4)
Limited staff resources and time constraints	28.6% (4)
Inopportune physical location	21.4% (3)
Institutional constraints on collaboration	28.6% (4)

Other (please specify)—additional responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- Independent activities
- Our missions are divergent and unrelated.
- Press is currently undergoing review. Future direction is still TBD.
- Different cultures, business models, goals

Press Respondents:

- Press and library collaborate but separate identities are essential.
- Collaboration is just starting to be explored.
- There has not been an identified need or benefit.
- I cannot speak for the institution; key administration is in transition

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 12)

24. If your institution is interested in pursuing a press/library partnership, do you have formal plans to do so? *(Note: 46 respondents skipped this question; 37 responded.)*

<u>Y/N</u>	<u>% OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Yes	13.5%
Not yet	62.2%
No interest	24.3%

Additional comments here included:

Library Respondents:

- We already partner around our institutional repository and their backlist; we are open to other partnerships with them but have no formal plan.
- We could be interested, but there hasn't yet been any pressure or particular reason to have this become a priority.
- We have a continuing dialog on what project we might undertake.
- Tentative plans

Press Respondents:

- We would be open to this but has not been a priority given other transformational efforts currently underway.
- Again, lots of collaboration, but kept separate from external point of view
- Nothing formal—ongoing meetings with the Library Dean
- Have tried; apples and Volkswagens thus far
- We at the Press are interested in exploring a partnership of some kind, if as stated in #22, we can find a balanced and feasible partnership. But it is not yet the appropriate time to pursue this.

25. What types of materials do the press and library partner to publish? Check all that apply.

(Note: 48 respondents skipped this question; 35 responded.)

<u>MATERIALS</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Peer-reviewed books and monographs	34.3% (12)
Non-peer reviewed materials (e.g., conference proceedings, etc.)	25.7% (9)
Peer-reviewed journals	11.4% (4)

Please describe new publishing programs planned within the partnership:

Library Respondents:

- See MediaCommons and related online
- Non-peer reviewed reprints; backlist digitization for university access is next big project

- Will do more joint publications
- Libraries publish non-commercial books; the press publishes books that have a commercial market.
- The press and the library have collaborated on various digital preservation projects in the past.
- Long Civil Rights Movement digital library complementing printed material
- HABRI Central <http://habricentral.org/>

Press Respondents:

- Tentative plans for a digital imprint that might include POD and commercial ebook sales by press and open access from library. Could be a pay-for-service model. Expect serious discussion to begin in the next year.
- The press gives library OA materials (mostly out of print) to play around with, and the press advises library on their occasional publications.
- Looking into an open access textbook
- A planned online site bringing together a range of resources related to aboriginal languages and cultures—an area for which the press is renowned—the library will provide a platform
- Our new digital encyclopedia of our state
- The press and library do not currently co-publish materials but representatives of both organizations are members of e-scholarship advisory group that works together on campus-wide digital scholarly publishing education/initiatives.
- Open access peer reviewed e-journals
- Digital archive of press backlist titles
- One open access publication series
- Particular focus on technical reports, student journals, and conference proceedings at the moment
- We are collaborating to put older titles on a relatively OA libraries' ebook platform
- Cooperative program to digitize our backlist for open access site
- The library has created a section of its institutional repository where the press can post materials that supplement printed books.

26. How are rights distributed to materials co-published by the press and library?

(Note: 51 respondents skipped this question.)

<u>RIGHTS DISTRIBUTION</u>	<u>% OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Rights are shared equally	12.5%
Rights are distributed proportionally, depending on origin of content	34.4%
Other arrangement	53.1%

Additional comments here included:

Library Respondents:

- Rights sharing has not been explicitly addressed, but revenue sharing has been equal or proportional, depending upon product and expense to unit.
- Library retains rights
- Haven't decided
- Case by case
- Since the press is an integral unit within the Libraries, there is no definition between libraries and press. The press director now heads the Libraries Scholarly Publishing Services.

Press Respondents:

- Materials are public domain so no rights division is necessary.
- Not in play at this time
- All publications are copyright [Name] University. There is no revenue split since press is part of libraries.
- Press retains and controls all rights
- Text is under Creative Commons but all images are copyright the museum/library.
- At this point it is not envisioned that the library will control any rights.
- Library faculty are contract signatories for projects they undertake.
- The press maintains the rights to these materials, but they are posted on an open-access basis.

27. How many years has the press and library collaboration lasted?

<u>YEARS</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
0 - 5 years	54.3% (19)
5 - 10 years	25.7% (9)
More than 10 years	20.0% (7)

28. What are your future publishing plans for the press/library partnership?

<u>PLANS</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Develop new publishing programs within partnership	70.6% (24)
Continue current publishing partnership	29.4% (10)
Suspend current publishing partnership	0.0% (0)

Additional responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- We have many more choices every year of publishing partners.
- None presently planned
- Print on demand for certain special collections

Press Respondents:

- Library may not wish to continue, press would like to
- Our digital library group (which we meet with quarterly) recently added ‘publisher’ to their name but as of yet they don’t seem to have a mission statement or purpose.
- One-time collaboration on making selected O/P books available on OA institutional repository. May or may not continue.
- Where appropriate we seek to work together.
- Books and journals cooperation for open access purposes

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 7)

PERSPECTIVES

29. Should publication projects be part of the library’s mission?

<u>Y/N</u>	<u>% OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Yes	61.6%
No	12.3%
No opinion	26.0%

30. If yes, in what ways should the scope and activities of the library publishing program differ from that of a university press?

	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Should complement the press programs	68.5% (37)
Should publish only archives and special collections materials	31.5% (17)
Should publish in different formats than the press	20.4% (11)
Should publish in different subjects and formats than the press	13.0% (7)
Should publish in different subjects than the press	9.3% (5)

Please comment—responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- Again, we have a different definition of roles than this survey implies.
- More ephemeral or faculty-centric specialized items; not intended for significant external revenue
- Should be much more agile than the press
- The press will continue to publish materials that require peer review; the libraries will be more flexible in publishing non-refereed materials.
- “Only” (archives and special collections materials) is too strong, “mostly” more accurate
- Not sure the press is a factor in the activities
- But at some point publication programs should draw closer together
- Authors are interested in more robust functionality than is provided by traditional publishers.

Press Respondents:

- The library shouldn’t really compete with the press. Wouldn’t this be a duplication of effort?
- Should concentrate on non-peer reviewed materials/projects
- I believe libraries should support scholarly communication but that doesn’t require them to publish necessarily. Still there is enormous potential for hosting and preserving research material related to books and to offer open access channels for scholars who need that.
- Libraries are not generally equipped to publish in a market-driven economy. Campus-based publishing works much better for libraries.
- A particular opportunity in less formal, non-peer reviewed, publications produced by faculty, staff, and students on campus
- They should provide ‘publishing’ tools and platforms for faculty content that does not rise to the level of investment of a university press publication.
- Should publish different types of publication and “publish” does not mean the same thing
- I think it’s fine if the library wishes to experiment with publishing and POD models for grey literature and non-peer reviewed material that they have access to (through special collections or archives). I don’t see much purpose in duplicating what the UP on campus might be doing. That seems to be a pull on resources and impinging on the traditional role of the UP.
- Should publish OA materials for highly specialized readerships.
- There are things the library can do that a press can’t.
- Communications should limit to non-peer reviewed materials.
- Non-peer reviewed pubs; and e-pubs the press cannot afford
- Should be primarily concerned with archival and defined university service projects.

- If library wants to publish should do so through the press.
- Libraries are well-suited to create and preserve free, online materials. They are rarely suited to engage in commerce, or in editing, design, and printing.
- I expect the library will pursue the publication of open-access peer-reviewed journals.

See follow-up interviews on this question (Interview Q&A 3)

31. What steps or programs might academic libraries undertake to better understand the needs of university presses and the audiences they serve? Check all that apply.

STEPS	% (#) OF RESPONDENTS
Talk with press staff about the finances of publishing	85.3% (64)
Discuss with publishers issues related to access, copyright, and fair use	84.0% (63)
Invite press staff to serve on library committees	68.0% (51)
Attend AAUP meetings	56.0% (42)
None of the above	4.0% (3)
Other (please specify):	28.0% (21)

Additional responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- We work together on strategic planning, brown bags about projects, and share a position supporting digital scholarly publishing.
- Librarians need schooling on the business side of publishing. It will help them in their collection development activities as well as their scholarly communications programs.
- Collaborate on developing institutional publishing portfolio and strategies.
- Continue with new digital library co-publishing projects—learn by doing.
- Press director serves on a library committee (university faculty Library Council) as *ex officio* member.
- Collaborate around discipline needs/interests.

Press Respondents:

- Bring vendors into the conversation.
- Avoid the adversarial tone that is too often a hallmark of press/library dialogue.
- Learn more about the differences between STM vs. arts and humanities publishers.
- An internship program, travel grants for librarians to attend AAUP annual meetings
- Serve on press advisory groups; invite press staff to discussions and meetings.
- I think in general it would be helpful for both parties to have a better sense in how a press's materials are being adapted and used for scholarship and what coming trends are for accessing scholarship. Unfortunately I find most libraries have done very little research on how exactly scholars and students are using materials.

- Meet with faculty re: their needs (print and digital) for course adoption and report to press.
- Get out of the library silo
- All of the above
- Library director and press director should meet regularly.
- Our library seems generally informed on these issues.
- Unfortunately, our many discussions do not seem to have done much to increase library understanding of the press. I am at wit's end as to what else to suggest.
- We already do collaborate with the library staff and university attorneys to give campus presentations on copyright, fair use, permissions, and publishing contracts. I doubt if the librarians could get funded to go to AAUP meetings.
- The more dialogue the better.

32. What steps or programs might scholarly publishers undertake to better understand the needs of academic libraries and the patrons and campuses they serve? Check all that apply.

<u>STEPS</u>	<u>% (#) OF RESPONDENTS</u>
Talk with libraries about other issues facing scholarly publishing	94.6% (70)
Discuss with librarians issues related to access, copyright, and fair use	85.1% (63)
Attend library conferences such as Charleston, Midwinter ALA, etc.	75.7% (56)
Invite library staff to serve on press board(s) or committees	73.0% (54)
None of the above	1.4% (1)
Other (please specify)	14.9% (11)

Additional responses here included:

Library Respondents:

- We are a collaborating organization.
- Press staff need to find safe ways of imagining a different set of publishing scenarios other than those that exist now. Blue sky vs. what we can do now. Be willing to embrace change and less skeptical of changes promoted by scholars.
- Be more open to digital initiatives.

Press Respondents:

- Avoid the adversarial tone that is too often the hallmark of press/library dialogue.
- Respect and understand that libraries have a very different, campus-based, perspective.
- Joint programs addressing campus needs under auspices of CIC, for example; more emphasis on mechanics of publishing in LIS programs; staff secondments on campus.

- Essentially the same response as above. Though often both parties and their users are at the mercy of the available delivery platforms available. For instance, the ARL marketplace is still almost solely dominated by PDF and not reflowable/EPUB formats. Certainly, focus groups, joint library/press public forums, and research into how other campuses are using technology can help move the dialogue along.
- All of the above
- We don't have funding or staff time to spare to go to ALA; most of our staff can't go to AAUP. We already do collaborate with the library staff and university attorneys to give campus presentations on copyright, fair use, permissions, and publishing contracts.

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

Interviews were conducted by both phone and email. Responses below have been edited from email correspondence or notes from phone conversations.

Q1: For those who have a representative of the library on the press's governing or advisory board, what was the objective for involving the library at this level? How is the partnership working? What role does the library board member play, or what is the nature of the exchange? Has it been beneficial, and in what way? Is there any downside to this type of collaboration?

[From a press director] For many years, our University librarian has served on our Press Editorial Advisory Board. She recently retired and at the same time we've reimagined our Board. We've created an Editorial Project Review board and are currently creating a Press Management Advisory board. One of the first orders of business will be to meet with the new librarian to understand her views on scholarly publishing, the role of libraries as potential publishing partnerships on campus, and many of the issues of the day (fair use and OA spring to mind.) My full intent is to invite the new librarian onto the Management Advisory Board. I think having a librarian on our board is invaluable. They understand what faculty want, how research is changing, can relay what happens to the end product (a crucial step often not fed back to the publisher), and have more detailed inroads to the campus community.

For years we've met with a fledgling digital publishing program within the University Library. We discussed a lot of avenues and ideas and would occasionally decide to tackle a project. Having said that, I don't really think the collaboration was productive. Our previous director wasn't particularly interested in exploring opportunities and the library seemed to have either limited resources or some other barrier when we talked about digital projects. In brief, I believe there was a lack of imagination and willingness to experiment on both ends. Much of that was due to the ignorance we both had of each other's intent, mission, and resources when it came to collaborating. I think there was no sense of shared purpose, of creating something with a demonstrable usage in mind (to be sure at no point were we antagonistic; in fact, it was a great

relationship just not a lot got done). And I blame a lot of that on our different commitments. The library being a campus-facing entity operating without the restraints of cost recovery, the press needing to push beyond doing things out of ‘good will’ or experimentation. The press needed all time and money rewarded with some kind of ROI, even if that was intellectual capital. We wanted to view projects from a consumer point of view as opposed to a user point of view. But there was a disconnect at that point. As fate would have it we’re also awaiting a new hire to head the libraries digital publishing project. This appointment coupled with a new University librarian could point the library in some interesting directions.

[From a library dean] There is not a specifically designated seat on the board for a library representative, but there is usually someone from the library on the board. This librarian serves the same role as a faculty designee, in that they possess a subject area specialty and advise as such. They do provide special information and consultation on issues of e-reserves, fair use, and copyright law. The interviewee feels the librarian can help clarify issues in discussions of intellectual property. The dean also lunches monthly with the university press director and feels they have a productive and collegial relationship.

Additional note: in discussing this topic, interviewee said that the libraries and the large consortia of which they were a part had discontinued work with the CCC (for a variety of reasons, among them the CCC’s participation in the Georgia State case, and also because the CCC requests rights to audits and other things that university counsel says the library cannot sign off on). Instead, they have signed with SIPX, a rights clearance company, and it may be worth presses checking into signing with this system to further enhance the discoverability of their content.

[From a press director] We involved the library director in our governing board because we seek information from “peripheral” participants in our business. We even have a bookstore owner on our board. The library director contributes a bit when we discuss cooperative ebook programs or library buying patterns, but these contributions are pretty routine. The danger is that the library might want to take us over, since they are very aware that some presses are now reporting to libraries! But the library director is a great person and has served as a mentor to me in dealing with the administration.

[From a university dean] The involvement of the university librarian or library dean on the advisory board pre-dates my time here. So I do not know what the original motivation was for including the librarian. In general I think the library is well-respected and the librarian is thought of as someone who has a background and perspective that is important for the press. I attend one annual meeting a year in which the press director reports on the state of the press. I attend about three or four additional meetings a year at which we review book proposals. Typically the books in question have already been reviewed by press staff and outside reviewers. These books are then assigned to the board (one book to each board member) and we deliver a summary report along with our opinion. I think the arrangement is beneficial for the press and the library. It’s helpful to know what they are doing and the arrangement encourages mutual support. I do not see a downside.

[From a press director] Governance was delegated by the Provost to the Director of Libraries. Excellent. There is great respect on both sides for what we each do. I have been called in many times to be a publishing resource for the library and work on projects together. The Board member has full voting rights on the Board, votes on the budget and approves LRPs, etc., but is also the boss I report to directly on campus. There has been no downside to this new relationship at all. If anything, the importance of the press and what it does has increased. There is always overlap of services. Alumni offices publish as do the professional schools, the development office, etc. We need to be seen not as competition but as a resource and vice versa. Perhaps OA publishing and consulting with campus divisions is part of the general redefinition of the function and role of a university press on campus

[From a library director] We have no formal relationship, but a good working relationship with the press—both have different roles. (Interviewee referenced a *Chronicle of Higher Education* article March 27, 2012 “Are you a Press or Are you a Library?” an interview with Monica McCormick of NYU Press.)

[From a press director] The Dean of Libraries serves on our editorial board (succeeding, on the press director’s request, a librarian who had volunteered and whose term was expiring). The Dean attends some but not all meetings, and this is fine with the press. Overall, the collaboration is mutually beneficial. The Dean is a vocal supporter and doesn’t hold back. We have a digital publications meeting every 4-6 weeks that staff from across the press are welcome to attend, and many do. The Dean and library staff attended the meeting at AAUP Executive Director Peter Berkery’s stop at the Press.

Our press collaborates with the library on three things:

1. Digitization of the press’s journals. The library trained the press to use their OA journals module as a creative and organizational tool for editors and staff.
2. Providing web-ready PDFs for the library’s community cardholder OA portal. We feel that the benefits of the visibility and support of mission outweigh the piracy and misuse risks.
3. The library and press are discussing enhanced ebooks and apps; for example, there are four titles that are bestselling textbooks, so they are looking at portals, sites, and subscription model issues.

Return to related data summary (Question 10)

Q2: Almost 90% of respondents said that academic departments or research centers conduct publishing activities independent of both the library and the press; is there any discussion or desire to centralize all institutional publishing activities, or create partnerships that include libraries, presses, and departments? If there are no plans for this, why? If you are planning to centralize all or some of these functions, what benefits are anticipated from such action?

[From a press director] To the best of my knowledge most departments at [our host institution] do not have a separate publication operation. If they did (or do) my response is the following. First, as a small UP we operate at maximum capacity (we publish 45 books a year with 7 people, tier 1 average is 10 people and 33 books). What we could offer these departments if we collaborate would be professional distribution. But we simply don't have space to take on editing/production for other departments' projects. And there is also the argument that university presses shouldn't be a "house organ," so to speak. We publish and disseminate across the academy as a whole. In my personal opinion, I don't think this traditional viewpoint should preclude an arrangement between a department and the press, but again it's likely a distribution one.

[From a press director] Publishing initiatives on our campus outside the press and library abound, with no plans to centralize them. University administration doesn't want to centralize such varied campus-wide efforts and would not welcome such an effort. The press has no resources to do a "service-publishing role" at all. We would offer advice on how to publish to other departments on campus but would avoid doing it for them at all costs.

[From a library dean] The library has not to date initiated any specific publishing activities or programs. We are, however, in the process of partnering with another university in the state system to procure and implement on campus a package of Open Journals Systems, open source publishing software that will be offered to some of the journal publishers on campus, primarily those who approach the library seeking assistance. We do not plan to target society journals (though they are free to use the editing features of the software should they wish) or the journals published through the press on campus. It will mostly be undergraduate journals and other publications running on a shoestring that will take advantage of and benefit most from this program.

[From a press director] [The press has] tried to centralize certain activities in the past, but the other units felt they would lose their brand and [the idea] received no support from the administration, just because they didn't have the courage to mess with established practices, even though they knew the decentralization was costing money and losing efficiencies. Now, most of these other operations on campus are suffering so much financially that [the press is] no longer interested in partnering with them!

[From a press director] While this might, on the one hand, sound like a good idea—and it might work under controlled circumstances, namely, if only one organization were involved—the different financial pressures, the different cultures, the political exigencies, and the different

resources across the campus argue against such partnerships. For example, were there five journals published by five departments across our university, it would make perfect sense to move all five journals under the publishing umbrella of either the press or the libraries. But it would be equally perfectly sensible not to include both the press and the libraries in such an undertaking.

[From a university librarian] There is a keen interest on campus now in commodity services and shared infrastructure both for efficiencies but also for more creative, productive collaborations and new possibilities. There are no plans now for press/library collaboration. Why? Because the press is very independent, receives a very small subvention, has its own governance structure and constitution. There is an appetite to explore shared infrastructure for content creation and publishing. By the latter, I mean traditional containers with peer review and editorial work; by the former I mean more projects in more diverse genres and processes involved in bringing to access the content. For example, the library is doing content creation, such as a Native American language dictionary. It's a collaboration between the library, faculty, a historical society, and Native Americans doing the audio. It's ongoing, not a fixed publication. The library is able to give more assistance in the development of learning objects.

[From a university dean] I am not aware of any plans to centralize these activities. The press was recently the subject of a presidential-level review. The review committee largely endorsed the value and mission of the press and as far as I can tell no changes have come from the review.

[From a press director] This would be nice to do, even from an awareness standpoint. There are journals being published by departments, but I'm sure the press is not aware of all of them. The press did an email survey last year to ask about department publications, but heard back only from the ones that we were already aware of. There would need to be a budget line for centralized activities.

Return to related data summary (Question 17)

Q3. Could you expand upon why publication programs should be part of the library mission? Is it to fill in gaps that are not being adequately served by university presses? Is there merit in overlap of services? Is library publishing part of the general redefinition of the function and role of a library on a modern university campus?

[From a press director] In terms of libraries being part of the publishing culture of the university as a whole I find myself increasingly skeptical of what the purpose is or at least how this is to be achieved. But to the point, no, we shouldn't overlap. My main issues center around the concept of professionalism and marginalization. (In the bluntest possible terms, I don't pretend to understand the nuts and bolts of how a library goes about its business, why do certain libraries think they understand the process of what we do?) When I sit down with a faculty member who wants to self-publish or begin to talk with our library's digital publishing group there is simply no knowledge of publishing. It's one thing to create content or even package it. That doesn't

mean you're publishing. They may understand a concept for a grouping of content or have a philosophy of content dissemination but that doesn't mean those things work. Often there is an utter lack of awareness of the workflow or steps, not to mention the necessary knowledge or resources to perform them.

You've likely heard all the arguments for university presses about peer review, and added value, and the technical side of what we do as opposed to a department or faculty member or library publishing group saying, oh, we don't need all that stuff, I can use InDesign and put it in CreateSpace or crowdsource peer review or just post on the internet. Those arguments don't worry me and to each their own. What worries me is when administrators begin to believe them. When faculty or librarians begin to believe that anything can be published this way because, look, we did it. And we have a book to show. And when the scant resources allotted to the press (10-20% of their budgets typically) are redirected to the library publishing unit because they have no cost recovery model but are visible to faculty and because the advertised end they see is somehow "free" (OA or fair use) so it carries favor in a political sense on campus. But as a fellow press director says, this isn't a moral issue, it's a business one.

Nor should presses be the only gatekeepers of academic-centered publishing. There should be room to act as a publisher of grey literature, repurpose special collections, etc., or more obviously in cases where the University doesn't have a university press. But I caution that this takes discretion and standards and best practices. I also feel it's a bit of a tree in a forest. Dissemination of publication is often the forgotten step. Making something available is not the same as making it discoverable, making sure that it's available through the proper resources, that it's archived, etc.

I've made sure that our Provost and University Librarian know that I'm not opposed to them publishing (mainly because I'm not in control of it). In fact, I'd like to help them do it correctly if they wish (and that doesn't mean to follow the same process but to give them options and an understanding of the process so they can adapt to their purposes.) But what I'd much rather see is the University and the library investing in and collaborating with their presses to publish whatever content is being discussed in a focused, professional way. Why not invest in creating units within presses (instead of the libraries) that perform these functions? Why develop them under the library umbrella when they could be 'published' more professionally within a press that has the hard-won skills to do so? With coordination, a specific and direct charge from the administration, and the understanding that we're each going to properly own and contribute what we're best at within the process, a press/library collaboration could work. To me this seems like the best of both worlds. You're discovering, curating, and reimagining non-traditional content and producing it and disseminating it with the skills that your press already has. A unit could also help individual departments with publishing concerns (as you mention above) as well.

[From a press director] We are a department of the library, which does its own publishing. The line between what they publish and what the press publishes is starting to blur. The library

doesn't have a structure for peer review. They use outside production firms to produce books when necessary. The press director reports directly to the librarian and it takes strong pushback from the press director to stop the library from trying to make the press publish something the library wants published [that does not meet the standards or mission of the press]. Occasionally one project "gets through" that the director agrees to do on a service basis for the library, [often under a separate imprint.]

Going forward, the press will continue to use this relatively unused imprint to do more library publications, though not for other departments throughout the university. Nevertheless, the press is forming alliances with other departments on campus, through series editing and other traditional means of making institutional connections.

[From a dean of libraries] Unlike some colleagues at other ARL libraries, I do not feel that it is the library's mission to provide publishing tools; it is not at the top of our library's mission or something that they feel they should put time and resources towards. Publishing is not our business; we would rather work together with the press but not duplicate services. However, successors may feel differently about this issue.

[From a university librarian] Motivation and campus context are everything. The infrastructure of new technologies can be exploited to serve publishing needs (such as how Hathi and M-Pub interplay.) Mission should be stressed, not just preservation and access; lifecycle engagement with projects is the hot new thing. Libraries step in to provide infrastructure and services to campuses and presses have not done so. While "curated" is an overused word, creation of curated content is absolutely the logical extension of mission.

[From a university dean] I don't necessarily believe that libraries should assume or take on a publishing program. I think that each campus is unique, and much depends on the local context. We publish exhibit catalogs and a few promotional pieces a year from the library. This is far from what the university press does. We also maintain a digital imprint. This was started a few years ago as a way to experiment with publishing and collaboration with the university press. I think the experience has been positive but at the moment I don't see it leading to a merging of the press and the library. The imprint works closely with the university press to consider works that for a variety of reasons have merit but aren't appropriate for the print monograph format. So usually this involves a situation where the university press has reviewed a book and finds it worthwhile but too big or too image intensive or something along those lines for its own interests. So the imprint considers the university press an important partner, and vice versa.

[From a press director] The library is being called on more and more to be the host of open access publications, and sometimes even the publisher of them. This makes complete sense to me. In our case they understand the differences between library and publisher and recognize that they are entering new and unfamiliar territories. This has led to greater collaborations and consultations with each other.

[From a library director] I have a philosophical problem with libraries as publishers. What libraries do is to provide a mechanism to make scholarship more accessible and available. Libraries don't have the infrastructure to publish.

[From a press director] The press has considered taking on a service-publishing role, or a copyright/permissions advisement, assistance with process role. However, there is insufficient staff time to do this, except in a few cases where it involves someone they really feel a connection or obligation to. We also considered doing this for a fee, but question whether this is really the press's role.

Return to related data summary (Question 30)

Q4. For Press Interviewees, a majority of your colleagues who responded to the survey said that cost recovery is an expectation for their program. Why do you think cost recovery for presses is more of a stated expectation than it is for library publishing programs?

[From a press director] It's an issue of culture both within the library and the university system in general. The cost recovery issue for libraries is obvious. That's not what they do in terms of philosophy nor budget, nor should they. The bigger question is, why is a university press expected to do it at all? If administrators are serious about supporting OA and fair use and decreasing textbook costs then the obvious answer is more support for their presses (and I'm speaking in general here, I wish to say that my administration is highly supportive financially and in terms of advocacy.) I don't understand how the general university press can only receive 10-20% of its costs covered. Shouldn't a university always cover payroll and infrastructure (mine does)? I mean, we are a university department. Generally, I'm really perplexed by the lack of university support for their presses. The typical university doesn't seem overly worried about other units that spend money if there is no hope to recover it. It's the price of knowledge. But the rules are different for this particular university department (the press).

Also, in terms of the framed question, I'm not sure it's a "stated" expectation that we make money. It's implied, as in you're not getting any more money than you're earning. But I'd venture to say that very few presses have a mission statement beyond the one they formed for themselves (not handed down from administration) and if they do it rarely has the words 'self-supporting' attached (though there are a few exceptions).

[From a press director] The cost recovery issue is thorny. I think this is just an artificial cultural difference. Presses are perceived as businesses and libraries as services. I wish we could work collectively to change this thinking.

[From a press director] This may be one of the most important questions asked. The different financial operating structures of libraries—an expenditure- or allocation-based budget—versus that of presses—an income- or a revenue-based budget, obscures especially for those in the libraries the fundamental challenge facing a publisher. Libraries receive a pot of money and must

spend that pot of money carefully and wisely. Presses receive a pot and are told to fill it with money...and spend it carefully and wisely. Even financial systems within universities, which generally operate on the assumption of an expenditure-based budget, are not always set up to accommodate a budget that is income-based. I discovered this concretely when, much to my delight, I was informed that a windfall of several hundred thousand dollars had been discovered. We worked assiduously to incorporate that previously buried treasure into our long-term strategic plans. Nearly nine months after learning of the windfall, we learned that because the press had submitted its budget—that was entered into the system—it was recorded as if the income associated with the press’s income-based budget had actually been received. That is, income that the press had projected as revenue for a past fiscal year had been recorded as if it had actually been allocated to the press, in the same way that a library is allocated funds. Lo and behold, it was only estimated revenue, so the windfall was a complete fiction.

[From a press director] Because it (the press) is not a direct contributor to the education of the local student body.

Return to related data summary (Question 13)

Q5. For Press Interviewees, are there limitations on press resources for dealing with electronic projects, or advantages to their being done within the library, since the majority of respondents indicated that libraries work primarily with electronic projects? How could this balance be shifted, and should it be?

[From a press director] Yes, I would like to see the electronic collaborations between libraries and publishers better implemented. As I mentioned above I think there needs to be a better understanding of what each bring to the table. But also an end purpose for each. Without that there’s not much use in it from the university press end. With it, I think ideas begin to develop, collaboration is fostered, and projects take flight. In general, the library holds a level of technical expertise and the press is good at leveraging content. It’s a matter of coordination.

[From a press director] The interaction between the press and library on digitization projects is “almost zero”—the library has almost nothing to do with our e-publishing program—the library is only interested in archival scanning, etc., whereas the press is doing e-books. (Though the library provided means for digitization of backlist—though only in PDF form—Apple had to convert finally to EPUB format). “E-frontlist” however, the library does not help with, nor does the library help with the press website (different needs). There are certain projects—e.g., an archival project—we can collaborate on. But the library does not affect press business strategy.

[From a press director] We have created some partnerships with our library in which we share some of the investment costs—usually in staff resources—for digital projects. Our [imprint name] paperback series, for example, is scanned by the preservation department at the libraries. There has also been strong interest in and a commitment to the press by the libraries to digitize the press’s entire backlist. This considerable cost would be borne in large measure by the

libraries. In short, at the moment, and for the four years that I've been director, the press typically relies on surplus revenue to invest in most of its digital publishing projects. This is especially the case, say, with journals.

[From a press director] All of our publications have both print and electronic editions that we produce. There's really nothing we need in this regard from the library. The library's strengths will come in hosting the scholarship we provide to them as it converts to an OA model.

[From a press director] Communication is key with the library, given the limitations on resources. The press had reached an agreement with the previous provost to spend on a new database and website, but we feel it's best to keep in touch with the library about what our mutual goals are and try to plan to co-own or collaborate on new initiatives.

Return to related data summary (Question 15)

Q6. For Press Interviewees whose presses report to libraries but do not report receiving financial support from the library, is the press budget maintained as part of the library budget, or it is accounted for separately?

[From a press director] Since the press reports directly to the library, there are conversations monthly between the press director and the university librarian. Sometimes a project comes up that is low risk and the press has little choice but to pursue in some safe form. Note that, ironically, since the Press was placed under the jurisdiction of the library, it has provided us with some institutional cover—our budget requests are now simply one line in the overall library budget. The overall university administration comes from STEM fields—so now reporting to library helps (the library administrators respect books) and provides an ally.

[From a press director] The press's budget is separate. We have our own budget fund number against which our chart of accounts sits.

[From a press director] Our budget comes out of the provost's office.

Return to related data summary (Question 7)

Q7. For Library Interviewees who stated that they are developing new programs in their current partnerships, what is the nature of those programs? What kind of materials or projects are they working on?

[From a library director] We are only currently developing a journals software program.

[From a library director] We are working on making scholarly information available and not competing with the press for monetary gain. Through the institutional repository (IR) we have:

- a. Provided access to theses and dissertations,
- b. Assisted faculty in getting their materials on the IR,
- c. Encouraged university research centers and institutes to provide information for the institutional repository,
- d. Looked for other examples of grey literature through community engagement opportunities.

[Return to related data summary \(Question 28\)](#)

Q8. For Library Interviewees who reported not knowing the financial expectations for their library publishing program, can you speculate about why this expectation has not been articulated, either by the program itself or by the administration overseeing the program? Is the program new or experimental? Are you drawing on funds already existing within the library budget or a separate source of funding?

[From a dean of libraries] The press reports to the university system, whereas the library reports to the main campus, so the allocations are coming from different places. Not much money is being put into this journals software.

[From a library director] The university press is self-sustaining. Library funding is used for IR (institutional repository) work.

[Return to related data summary \(Question 14\)](#)

Q9: For Library Interviewees who reported library publication programs that serve scholars, what are the benefits of those programs? Are any of the library publishing programs providing a service not being provided to the faculty elsewhere in academe?

[From a dean of libraries] Our journals software won't duplicate anything the press is doing, so it is a service that wasn't being provided elsewhere on campus. On a more general note, other campuses do have duplicate programs, and there is general perception among librarians that university presses have somehow dropped the ball, especially with electronic/digital publishing, and are behind the times and aren't serving scholars as they might. So in response to that, I believe that's why many libraries have jumped into publishing projects.

University presses have earned this bad rap in part because the AAUP and university presses as a whole have not done a good job of touting their own accomplishments and doing institutional PR. Your story, told at the lowest level, where you sell 200 copies of a monograph that few people will buy and read, is simply not compelling. This is not meant with animosity, and I feel that in the past AAUP/ARL dialogs have been unproductive because each side had taken a strident stance ("I have all the right answers") and no one was willing to see or discuss the gray areas. Again, I'm very much in favor of collaboration and mutual understanding, so these comments are meant in a cooperative spirit.

[From a university librarian] Faculty projects, OA journals: our library publishing program provides services not being provided elsewhere. The press could not have done some of the types of projects the library has done. A big online language dictionary project was grant funded, and the costs were entirely covered due to the faculty member's grant. The library did contribute staff time, and hired to cover that staff due to capacity issues, so yes, the library could afford to do something the press couldn't, even though it was subsidized.

[From a library director] Materials are being digitized and made available on the institutional repository that are beyond the scope or not profitable for commercial/university press publishers and otherwise would not be available.

Return to related data summary (Question 20)

Q10. For Library Interviewees whose library publishing programs were reported to consist chiefly or exclusively as institutional repositories or as publishers of theses/dissertations, would you define this as a full service publishing program? Do you see these activities as complementary to press publishing programs?

[From a dean of libraries] I would not define these as publishing programs; they are simply an archiving and access function of the library. Each dissertation is deposited there in electronic format, and several years ago ProQuest gave them a good deal on digitizing their "backlist" of dissertations. The content of these dissertations is OA within the campus system and searchable from the outside.

[From a university librarian] No! Of course not, not full service. We don't publish the theses/dissertations, we disseminate and preserve them. We can make contributions with technology and author's rights, but these are complementary [to press activities] and serve different purposes.

[From a director of libraries] Libraries don't have the infrastructure to be publishers. We digitize and make information available.

Return to related data summary (Question 18)

Q11. For Library Interviewees that are not engaging in publishing initiatives, who have an affiliated press, do you plan to reach out to your institutional press to explore the possibilities?

[From a director of libraries] We have a good working relationship with our university press. The press has made available some out-of-print books for our IR, and they are now available as ebooks.

[From a university librarian] I've spoken to the press director about this, but because the press is stable financially there is no pressure or impetus to bring us more deeply together.

Return to related data summary (Question 18)

Q12: For those organizations not collaborating on a library publishing program, how would you conceptualize a library publishing program, or a partnership? Do you feel that would be useful for meeting their publishing goals? Why or why not?

[From a press director] I am not a fan of collaborating on a library publishing program, though I would do so if someone else took the initiative. I find the library folks to be smart and wonderful but they have no sense of deadlines or costs. Also, most programs are designed to be little experiments, with no follow-through or sustainability. In short, we are spread so thinly here, working on new ebook projects and new fields of acquisition, that I need to be strategic about how many other ventures we can take on.

[From a press director] A good partnership could be conceptualized by sharing information on such matters as rights and permissions, fair use, content stewardship, etc., and by promoting one another on campus.

[From a university librarian] We are interested in trans-institutional collaborations, such as the one we tried getting off the ground with state partners, but that experience ground to a halt when a principal got hurt. I do think such partnerships could be useful in that there is no reason why one place needs to do all things.

Return to related data summary (Question 23)

APPENDIX A

AAUP Library-Press Collaboration Survey Participating Libraries and Presses

PARTICIPATING LIBRARIES

Auburn University
Boston University
Colorado State University
Columbia University
Dartmouth College
Duke University
George Washington University
Johns Hopkins University
Louisiana State University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
New York University
Northwestern University
Ohio University
Penn State University
Princeton University
Purdue University
Queen's University
Rice University
Rutgers University
Texas A&M University Libraries
Texas Tech University
The Ohio State University
University at Albany
University of Arizona
University of California, Berkeley
University of Colorado-Boulder
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Iowa
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill
University of Notre Dame
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
University of Tennessee
University of Toronto
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Washington University in St. Louis

PARTICIPATING PRESSES

Baylor University Press
Duke University Press
Fordham University Press
Harvard University Press
Louisiana State University Press
Minnesota Historical Society Press
MIT Press
New York University Press
Pennsylvania State University Press
Purdue University
RAND Corporation
Russell Sage Foundation
Rutgers University Press
Stanford University Press
Syracuse University Press
Texas A&M University Press
The University of Akron Press
University of Alabama Press
University of Arizona Press
University of British Columbia Press
University of Hawaii Press
University of Illinois Press
University of Iowa Press
University of Massachusetts Press
University of Minnesota
University of Nebraska Press
University of New Mexico Press
University of North Carolina Press
University of North Texas
University of Pennsylvania Press
University of Pittsburgh
University of Texas
University of Toronto Press
University of Wisconsin Press
University Press of Florida
University Press of Kansas
University Press of Mississippi
University Press of New England
Vanderbilt University Press
Wayne State University Press
Wesleyan University Press